

KING COUNTY
REGIONAL GOVERNANCE SUMMIT

King County
Suburban Cities Association
City of Seattle

REPORT TO THE PUBLIC

March 27, 1991

SUMMIT MEMBERS

Suburban Cities

Randy Barton, Mayor, Kirkland
Earl Clymer, Mayor, Renton
Debbie Ertel, Mayor, Federal Way
Fred Jarrett, City Councilmember, Mercer Island
Terry Lukens, Mayor, Bellevue
Doreen Marchione, Mayor, Redmond
Fritz Ribary, Mayor, North Bend
Bob Roegner, Mayor, Auburn

City of Seattle

Norm Rice, Mayor
Paul Kraabel, President, City Council
George Benson, Councilmember
Cheryl Chow, Councilmember
Sue Donaldson, Councilmember
Jane Noland, Councilmember
Dolores Sibonga, Councilmember
Sam Smith, Councilmember
Jim Street, Councilmember
Tom Weeks, Councilmember

King County

Tim Hill, Executive
Lois North, Chair, County Council
Paul Barden, Councilmember
Brian Derdowski, Councilmember
Audrey Gruger, Councilmember
Bruce Laing, Councilmember
Greg Nickels, Councilmember
Kent Pullen, Councilmember
Ron Sims, Councilmember
Cynthia Sullivan, Councilmember

Staff

Jim Waldo, Facilitator
Cynthia Stewart, King County
Chuck Mize, Bellevue (for Suburban Cities)
Paul Matsuoka, Seattle

INTRODUCTION

On September 5, 1990, 21 elected officials from the City of Seattle, suburban cities and King County met in an unprecedented Regional Governance Summit to begin discussing how regional decisions affecting all of the jurisdictions in the county should be made. The group met eleven times and held two public hearings between September and March to work through a number of issues related to how governance in the county should be structured to best address growth management problems; to coordinate transportation planning with growth management planning; to consider issues related to delivery of local services in the unincorporated areas of the county; and to resolve legal questions surrounding the governance of METRO, the countywide transit and water quality agency.

The Regional Governance Summit has crafted a preliminary proposal, which is described in this report, for public review and comment. This proposal would substantially reorganize countywide government by merging King County and METRO, providing a direct role for local governments in regional decisionmaking, and changing the relationships between regional and local governments in growth management, public transit and water quality.

A series of public forums sponsored by the League of Women Voters will provide additional information and an opportunity for public discussion of this proposal. The Summit will hold public hearings on the proposal and will meet during May, 1991 to finalize the proposal and prepare a proposition for voter approval in November, 1991. These meetings are as follows:

League of Women Voters Town Meetings:

Monday, April 15 7:30 p.m. Shoreline Community Center 18560 1st Ave. N.E. Seattle	Wednesday, April 17 7:30 p.m. Totem Jr. High School 26630 - 40th Ave. S. Kent	Thursday, April 18 7:30 p.m. Redmond City Hall 15670 N.E. 85th Redmond
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

(CONTINUED NEXT PAGE)

Summit Public Hearings:

Monday, April 22
7:00 p.m.
Seattle City
Council Chambers
600 4th Ave.
Seattle

Wednesday, May 1
7:00 p.m.
Auburn City Council
25 W. Main St.
Auburn

Thursday, May 2
7:00 p.m.
Redmond City Hall
15670 N.E. 85th
Redmond

For more information about the Regional Governance Summit proposal, please call 296-1688.

PROPOSAL FOR FUTURE METROPOLITAN KING COUNTY GOVERNANCE

1. **Merger.** Metro government and King County government should be merged. Transit and Sewer~~s~~ should become utilities answerable to the directly elected Council and Executive for operations and to the Council and joint intergovernmental committee for long-range plans and other designated issues. The merged government will continue to provide existing county-wide services. Billing for county wide services, such as water quality, shall be made directly to the consumer of the services by the Metropolitan King County government.
2. **Metropolitan King County Council.** The Metropolitan King County Council should be directly elected from 13 districts and organized to the extent feasible to reflect local political jurisdictions. The question of whether elections should be non-partisan should be on a separate ballot.
3. **County-wide Planning.** The new Metropolitan King County government should have authority for integrated county-wide planning on issues of county-wide significance including but not limited to a comprehensive policy plan (focused on growth management and economic development with scope to be determined), transportation (including transit), water quality, and surface water management. County-wide plans should reflect local plans to the maximum extent consistent with achievement of regional goals. The planning process should be collaborative between the county and cities. After completion, local plans should be consistent with the designated county-wide plans.
4. **Joint Intergovernmental Committees - Regional and Local Participation.** Legislative review of designated county-wide issues should begin in joint intergovernmental committees, each chaired by a member of the Metropolitan King County Council and each with 12 votes, half to be exercised by Metropolitan King County Councilmembers and half distributed proportionally among Seattle and suburban cities. Decisions by the intergovernmental committees should be submitted for final approval by the Metropolitan King County Council where they would be subject to amendment by a super-majority of two-thirds.

The question of whether unincorporated areas should have additional, direct representation in intergovernmental committees should be explicitly identified as an issue for public comment. If such representation were to be added, it would change the allocation of votes to six for the Metropolitan King County Council, and six divided proportionately among Seattle, suburban cities, and the unincorporated areas. Representatives on the intergovernmental committees will vary based on the subject area. Each group represented on a committee would be responsible for selecting representatives from their group of elected officials to serve on the intergovernmental committees.

5. **Designated Intergovernmental Issues.** Initially, issues designated for intergovernmental review should be the county-wide comprehensive policy plan (the scope to be determined by the intergovernmental committee and/or dictated by state law), transportation plan, transit plan, water quality plan, surface water management plan, and capital facilities plan including siting criteria. Attachments A, B and C outline in greater detail the regional and local responsibilities for these issues and expand upon the definition of scope of issues to be addressed by the intergovernmental committees.

The initial countywide comprehensive policy plan will only be deemed approved when it has been ratified and approved by one third of all of the units of general government in King County (including the Metropolitan King County Council) representing 75 percent of the population in King County. Failure of a jurisdiction to act within 120 days after receipt of the plan shall be taken as approval. Any future amendments to the adopted plan will not be subject to this specific approval authority.

A mechanism will be developed to provide for future flexibility to change or modify the number of intergovernmental committees and issues to be addressed through the collaborative process over time.

6. **New Intergovernmental Issues.** New issues may be added to this category based on a process to be determined. It is the summit's intent that health and human services be among the first issues to be added.
7. **Conflict Resolution.** The State should amend the Growth Management Act to provide that where the county and cities agree on a process to resolve conflicts among local and county-wide plans, no appeals to the state level will be needed and state sanctions will be available to enforce local decisions.

8. **Local Services.** Principles regarding the provision of local services in unincorporated areas should include:

- a. Metropolitan King County government should create accounting systems and policies which will distinguish between regional and municipal services and between urban and rural services and make explicit the subsidies appropriate to types of service in different areas. Regional services will be funded by defined regional tax sources or user fees established by the Metropolitan King County Council and charged to direct service recipients.
- b. Services in rural areas will continue to need subsidies from urban areas.
- c. Metropolitan King County government may continue to provide contract services.

Implementation of the above principles, including the possible need to create a new form of local service district, should be a designated intergovernmental issue.

9. **Other.** Metropolitan King County would implement the following measures:

- a. Establish separate revenue and expenditure accounting for unincorporated areas to implement paragraph 8 above.
- b. Strengthen comprehensive plan policies for annexation/incorporation by:
 - 1. Beginning to work with cities to adopt city growth area boundaries (within the designated urban area of the county) as soon as possible;
 - 2. Establishing the county's intent to adopt applicable city design and site development standards for urbanizing areas within any city's growth areas, and to offer to contract with the city to process land use applications;
 - 3. Agreeing to evaluate a range of growth phasing techniques to ensure development concurrent with the provision of urban services by cities.
- c. Work with cities to coordinate infrastructure development within city growth boundaries.

- d. Review rural density standards and create stronger separators between urban and rural to reduce impacts of each area on the other.

- 10. Metropolitan King County Executive. The Metropolitan King County Executive will be directly-elected county-wide.

SUGGESTED DEFINITION OF REGIONAL VS. LOCAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND AUTHORITIES - PHASE I

Revised - 3/27/91

- Indicates a designated issue for Joint Intergovernmental Committee
- # Indicates issue requiring local ratification

Function	Regional Responsibility	Local Responsibility
Growth Management and Land Use Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # Regional Comprehensive Plan, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Designation of and policies for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Urban growth areas o Critical areas o Resource lands o Rural areas B. Policies for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Urban area densities and distribution o Phasing of development and services in urban unincorporated areas o Annexation/incorporation o Regional capital facilities siting, including fair share distribution o Economic development o Housing o Transportation o New communities o Human services [note: it is assumed that a joint intergovernmental committee will later be added to develop a countywide human services policy plan] • Functional Plans, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Economic development plan o Regional open space plan o Planning for new communities o Housing plan <p>Provide regional data functions</p> <p>Site regional capital facilities (See Notes attached)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use Joint Intergovernmental Committee to certify that local plans (city comp. plans, uninc. area plans, water and sewer district plans) are consistent with countywide plans; disputes unresolved by the Joint Intergovernmental Committee would be referred to the Regional Council for final decision 	<p>Participate in development of regional plans</p> <p>Ratify regional comprehensive plan</p> <p>Implement regional policies and integrate regional and local planning through adoption of local comprehensive plans, local development standards, zoning, land use regulations and management of size, scale and mix of uses and design of activity centers</p> <p>Adopt additional local policies which are not inconsistent with regional plan</p> <p>Develop local annexation policies consistent with the regional policies</p> <p>Maintain local data bases as needed</p>

Notes to Definition of Regional vs. Local Responsibilities and Authorities

1. Siting of Regional Capital Facilities

The Growth Management Act requires capital facilities planning as part of the regional comprehensive plan. Policies for siting regional facilities are identified in this proposal as a regional issue designated for consideration by a joint intergovernmental committee. These policies will include identification of which types of regional capital facilities are needed, in which general areas of the county these facilities should be located, and other policies, such as how fair share distribution of these facilities will be achieved. In addition, some specific facilities may be identified by the joint intergovernmental committee for additional siting activities, although most facility siting would be done by the regional government without joint intergovernmental committee involvement, pursuant to the adopted policies.

Local governments in their respective local comprehensive plans would adopt regional siting policies which are consistent with the regional plan to aid in identifying which areas of the local jurisdiction will accommodate each type of regional facility.

Siting activities are assumed to be a regional government function which will not generally require joint committee involvement because siting will be done consistent with the previously adopted siting facilities. Siting activities include identification and acquisition of specific locations, production of any required environmental impact statements and acquisition of necessary permits. Local governments would use the permitting process to negotiate specific locations and mitigation requirements with the regional government, consistent with the regional comprehensive plan.

SUGGESTED DEFINITION OF REGIONAL VS. LOCAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND AUTHORITIES - PHASE I

Revised - 3/27/91

- Indicates a designated issue for Joint Intergovernmental Committee
- # Indicates issue requiring local ratification

Function	Regional Responsibility	Local Responsibility
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop countywide transportation plan, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Travel forecasts o Prioritization Process o High capacity transit corridors and facilities o Transit facilities o Service plan, including allocation of service hours to broad geographic areas and to special populations o Arterial plans o HOV system, including park and ride lots o Road Adequacy Standards o Transportation demand management policies, including mitigation fee policies o Financing plan and financial and ratemaking policies, including fare structures but not fare setting o Siting policies for regional transportation facilities Federal Aid to Urban Systems (FAUS) distribution (formerly performed by PSCOG King SRC) Transit Operations, including budget and fares Rideshare/Vanpool operations • Use Joint Intergovernmental Committee to certify that local plans (city transp. plans, uninc. area transp. plan) are consistent with countywide land use and transportation plans; disputes unresolved by the Joint Intergovernmental Committee would be referred to the Regional Council for final decision 	<p>Participate in development of regional plans</p> <p>Develop local transportation plans consistent with countywide plan</p> <p>Street/roads CIP and maintenance</p> <p>Adoption of local mitigation fees and demand management strategies consistent with countywide policies</p> <p>Permit approvals</p>

SUGGESTED DEFINITION OF REGIONAL VS. LOCAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND AUTHORITIES - PHASE I

Revised - 3/27/91

- Indicates a designated issue for Joint Intergovernmental Committee
- # Indicates issue requiring local ratification

Function	Regional Responsibility	Local Responsibility
Water Quality (Note: This includes SWM & METRO water quality)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop countywide plans, including identification of facility needs, system sizing to meet projected demand, environmental requirements, financing plan (financial and ratemaking policies, including rate structures, but not ratesetting) for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o sewage treatment o river basins o floodplain management o regional drainage • Develop effluent and water quality standards (consistent with state and federal laws) • Develop floodplain management plans and regulations • Develop regional drainage standards <p>Monitor floodplain regulations</p> <p>Establish and implement water quality inspection and enforcement programs, including testing lab services</p> <p>Site, construct and maintain regional facilities consistent with countywide comprehensive plan siting policies</p> <p>Adopt budgets and rates for above services</p> <p>Establish and implement billing and collection systems for regional rates</p> <p>Operate sewage pre-treatment and water re-use programs</p> <p>Establish disposal regulations</p> <p>Issue discharge permits</p> <p>Monitor industrial waste programs and industrial waste discharge</p> <p>Implement necessary conservation programs</p> <p>Design and implement regional CSO controls, including rate incentives for local CSO programs</p> <p>Public education</p>	<p>Participate in development of regional plans and standards</p> <p>Adopt local floodplain regulations consistent with regional plans and regulations</p> <p>Implement local sewage collection system consistent with countywide land use and service delivery plans</p> <p>Implement local surface water drainage regulations and system consistent with countywide policies and plans</p> <p>Establish local capital planning and financing programs, including implementation of necessary improvements or additions to local systems</p> <p>Establish local rates for service; bill for and collect local rates</p> <p>Design and implement inspection programs to insure compliance with local standards and regulations</p> <p>Customer service programs, including local education/information</p>